

Appln No. 10/088,450

Amdt date January 8, 2004

Reply to Office action of October 8, 2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office action of October 8, 2003, Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 14, 16 and 18. No claims have been added and no claims have been canceled. Claims 1-22 are currently pending.

Applicant has amended the drawings as suggested by the Examiner. Approval of Figures 1-11 as formal drawings is hereby requested.

Applicant has amended the title and abstract of the application, as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests that these amendments be entered without objection.

On pages 2-4 of the Office action, claims 1-22 are rejected as indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 14, 16 and 18 as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant therefore requests that the rejection to these claims be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 10, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that "sheet metal angle" is a well-known term in the art ("blechwinkel" in German), which is also discussed in exemplary form throughout the specification. See, e.g., Figs. 10-11, page 5 lns. 17-22 and page 17 lns. 5-11. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claim 10 is sufficiently definite to be allowable and requests that its rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant notes with appreciation that the Examiner indicates that claims 1-22 would be allowed if amended to more definitely claim the invention. Applicant respectfully submits

Appln No. 10/088,450

Amdt date January 8, 2004


Reply to Office action of October 8, 2003

that claims 1-22 are now in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner's 112 rejections be withdrawn.

On pages 4-5 of the Office action, the Examiner discusses the reasons he believes the invention is patentable. Applicant believes the Examiner's stated reasons for allowance are unnecessary. The applicant does not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance. While applicant agrees that the claims are allowable, applicant does not acquiesce with each statement in the reasons for allowance, that patentability requires each stated feature exactly as expressed by the Examiner, nor that each stated feature is required for patentability.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 
Rose A. Hickman
Reg. No. P-54,167
626/795-9900

RAH/rah

MEE PAS544377.1--*-01/8/04 5:38 PM



Fig. 1




Fig. 4






Fig. 5




Fig. 6





Fig. 7






Fig. 10

